

REMARKS

The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed April 23, 2007 and offers the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 9-14, and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by International Publication No. WO 02/49329 A2 to *Ilan et al.* (hereinafter "*Ilan*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Prior to addressing the rejections, the Applicant provides a brief summary of the present invention. According to the present invention, a packet gateway is provided in association with a telephony switch, such that circuit-switched connections through a switching fabric of the telephony switch are supported by the packet gateway. The packet gateway provides an interface between the switching fabric and a packet network. The packet gateway supports operator terminals as well as monitor terminals from which interactions between operators and callers may be monitored. Upon setting up the circuit-switched connection for the operator services call, the gateway will establish voice sessions with both the operator terminal and the monitor terminal. The voice sessions with the operator terminal facilitate bi-directional communications with the caller via the circuit-switched connection over the packet fabric. By using the packet gateway to facilitate the voice sessions with the operator terminal as well as with the monitor terminal for those sessions that require monitoring, the number of resources on the circuit-switched side of the switch is significantly reduced.

According to Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant submits that *Ilan* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-5, 9-14, and 18-23. More specifically, claim 1 recites a method for providing operator services comprising, among other features, "providing an interface between the operator voice session and the connection to facilitate a voice interaction between the operator and the caller." Claims 10 and 19 include similar features. The Applicant submits that *Ilan* does not disclose or suggest facilitating a voice interaction between an operator and a caller by providing an interface between an operator voice session and a connection from a caller. In maintaining the rejection, the Patent Office asserts that *Ilan* discloses this feature at page 7, lines 3-6.¹ The Applicant respectfully disagrees. At most, the cited portion of the reference discloses that a VoIP gateway 24B may connect to a

¹ See Office Action mailed April 23, 2007, page 3.

trunk 22 such that when a call is transferred from a PSTN 20 to a circuit-switched switch 18 via the trunk 22, the VoIP gateway 24B may tap the trunk 22, capture audio, and deliver it to a recording environment 14.² However, the VoIP gateway 24B does not facilitate a voice interaction between an operator and a caller by providing an interface between an operator voice session and a connection from a caller nor does *Ilan* suggest this feature. Instead, the call from the PSTN 20 to the circuit-switched switch 18 is occurring regardless of the VoIP gateway 24B. Accordingly, claims 1, 10, and 19 are patentable over *Ilan* and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-5, 9, 11-14, 18, and 20-23, which ultimately depend from claims 1, 10, or 19, are patentable for at least the same reasons along with the novel features recited therein.

Claims 6, 7, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ilan* in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,043,008 B1 to *Dewan* (hereinafter “*Dewan*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

According to Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicant submits that neither *Ilan* nor *Dewan*, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests all the features recited in claims 6, 7, 15, and 16. As indicated above, *Ilan* does not disclose or suggest all the features recited in claims 1 and 10, the base claims from which claims 7 and 16 respectively depend. In addition, *Dewan* does not address the previously noted shortcomings of *Ilan*. As such, claims 7 and 16 are patentable over the cited references and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6 recites that “the connection over the switching fabric connects with a conference port.” Claim 15 includes similar features. The Applicant submits that neither *Ilan* nor *Dewan* disclose that a connection over a switching fabric connects with a conference port. As correctly pointed out by the Patent Office, *Ilan* does not disclose this feature.³ Similarly, *Dewan* does not disclose or suggest this feature. In maintaining the rejection, the Patent Office states that *Dewan* discloses this feature at col. 4, lines 20-37.⁴ The Applicant respectfully disagrees. While *Dewan* generally discloses routing IP voice data to an IP monitoring and recording device 406 and that different equipment would be necessary to perform speech analysis and the use of a network

² See *Ilan*, page 7, lines 3-6.

³ See Office Action mailed April 23, 2007, page 4.

⁴ See Office Action mailed April 23, 2007, page 4.

protocol, *Dewan* does not disclose or suggest that a connection over a switching fabric connects with a conference port. Therefore, claims 6 and 15 are patentable over the cited references and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 17, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ilan*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 8 recites "providing an interface between the second operator voice session and the second connection to facilitate a second voice interaction between the operator and the second caller." Claims 17 and 24 include similar features. As detailed above, *Ilan* does not disclose or suggest facilitating a first voice interaction between an operator and a first caller by providing an interface between an operator voice session and a connection from the first caller. Thus, *Ilan* cannot disclose or suggest facilitating a second voice interaction between an operator and a second caller by providing an interface between an operator voice session and a connection from the second caller. For this reason, the Applicant submits that claims 8, 17, and 24 are patentable over *Ilan* and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The present application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicant's representative regarding any remaining issues in an effort to expedite allowance and issuance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By: 

Anthony J. Josephson
Registration No. 45,742
100 Regency Forest Drive, Suite 160
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 238-2300

Date: July 18, 2007
Attorney Docket: 7000-289